

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/800,530	Applicant(s) SCHWARTZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Sherali Ishrat	Art Unit 2621	

All Participants:

(1) Sherali Ishrat.

(2) Kevin Shao.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 July 2005

Time: 1:00 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Previous Office Action

Claims discussed:

1-24

Prior art documents discussed:

Lynch (US 6,229,929) and Raghunath (US 5,946,349).

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's Attorney that Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 20 to include limitation "each bitplanes corresponding to one-bit-per pixel image capable of being displayed overlaying with one or more other bitplanes". This new limitation is obvious over prior art of record because this is the definition of image bitplanes and image bitplanes are shown by prior art of record such as Lynch. Furthermore Examiner advised Applicant's Attorney in order to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant should include limitations from specification, pages 60-61. Examiner also informed Applicant's Attorney that independent claim 20 has 35 U.S.C 101 problem. Claim 20 should recite computer recordable media, instead of just media. Applicant Attorney asked Examiner to amend independent claims by an examiner's amendment to include limitation shown in the specification, page 60-61 which will be provided to Examiner by right-fax and also amend independent claim 20 to overcome 35 U.S.C problem.